



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,135	02/15/2001	Yang-lim Choi	Q60575	1486
7590 05/18/2004			EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,			HIRL, JOSEPH P	
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	N, DC 20037-3213		2121	
			DATE MAILED: 05/18/2004	16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	-D
Advisory Action	09/783,135	CHOI ET AL.	Q
, aviour, , touen	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph P. Hirl	2121	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 26 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applica (1) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in	
PERIOD FOR I	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the ma b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of thi no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expir ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). T fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the perio fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the C timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3'	s Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth re later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF d of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply office later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate exten unt of the fee. The appropriate exter originally set in the final Office action	sion nsion : or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C	FR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered			
(a) they raise new issues that would require fur	•	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	·		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying t	he
(d)  they present additional claims without canc NOTE:	eling a corresponding number of f	nally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s): See Continuation Sheet.		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	ld be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendme	nt
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request f application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the	<b>;</b>
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims	ent(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b) would be rejected is provided belo	☐ will be entered and an w or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	S:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-16</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap	oproved or b) disapproved by t	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent( <u>s)(</u> PTO-1449 <del>)</del> Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	left		
Supervisor	neny Knight y Patent Examiner	051102	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Following to the Advisory Action of May 3, 2004, it is noted by inspection of the illustration of page 1 of the Intermediate Value Theorem that while f(x) is stated as being continuous, in actual fact it is discontinuous at the approximate points of "a" minus, "a" plus and also at the point of "a" plus one tic; df/dx is not defined at these points.

As noted in the prior office action, establishing G(x) as a continuous function has no impact on the functionality of f(a).

The Examiner considers the applicants writings concerning the Intermediate Value Theorem to be a manifestation of the Examiner's concern that the specification simply does not provide sufficient instruction to allow one of ordinary skill in the art to replicate the invention without undue experimentation.

